

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Young-Tae CHANG et al.

Application No.: 10/694,353

Filed: October 28, 2003

For: SYNTHESIS AND USE OF NITROPHENOL

Art Unit: 1713

Examiner: Bernard Lipman

Washington, D.C.

Atty.'s Docket: CHANG169A

Date: November 2, 2005

Confirmation No. 2553

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building, Mail Stop Amendment
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a [XX] REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND REMARKS in the above-identified application.

[] Small Entity Status: Applicant(s) claim small entity status. See 37 C.F.R. §1.27.

[XX] No additional fee is required.

[] The fee has been calculated as shown below:

(Col. 1)		(Col. 2)		(Col. 3)	SMALL ENTITY		OR	OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY	
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA EQUALS	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE		RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL	* 11	MINUS	** 20	0	x 25	\$		x 50	\$
INDEP.	* 5	MINUS	*** 5	0	x 100	\$		x 200	\$
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM					+ 180	\$		+ 360	\$
					ADDITIONAL FEE TOTAL	\$	OR	TOTAL	\$

* If the entry in Col. 1 is less than the entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3.

** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, write "20" in this space.

*** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, write "3" in this space.

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (total or independent) is the highest number found from the equivalent box in Col. 1 of a prior amendment of the number of claims originally filed.

[XX] Conditional Petition for Extension of Time

If any extension of time for a response is required, applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor.

[] It is hereby petitioned for an extension of time in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a). The appropriate fee required by 37 CFR 1.17 is calculated as shown below:

Small Entity

Response Filed Within

[] First - \$ 60.00

[] Second - \$ 225.00

[] Third - \$ 510.00

[] Fourth - \$ 795.00

Month After Time Period Set

Other Than Small Entity

Response Filed Within

[] First - \$ 120.00

[] Second - \$ 450.00

[] Third - \$ 1020.00

[] Fourth - \$ 1590.00

Month After Time Period Set

[] Less fees (\$) already paid for ___ month(s) extension of time on _____.

[] Please charge my Deposit Account No. 02-4035 in the amount of \$ _____.

[] Credit Card Payment Form, PTO-2038, is attached, authorizing payment in the amount of \$ _____.

[] A check in the amount of \$ _____ is attached (check no.).

[XX] The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4035. This authorization and request is not limited to payment of all fees associated with this communication, including any Extension of Time fee, not covered by check or specific authorization, but is also intended to include all fees for the presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR §1.16 and all patent processing fees under 37 CFR §1.17 throughout the prosecution of the case. This blanket authorization does not include patent issue fees under 37 CFR §1.18.

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
Telephone: (202) 628-5197

By: 
Apple M. Kombau
Registration No. 25,884



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket: CHANG169A

In re Application of:)	Conf. No.: 2553
)	
Young-Tae CHANG et al)	Art Unit: 1711
)	
Appln. No.: 10/694,353)	Examiner: Bernard Lipman
)	
Filed: October 28, 2003)	Washington, D.C.
)	
For: SYNTHESIS AND USE OF...)	November 2, 2005

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND REMARKS

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

The Office Action mailed October 6, 2005, in the nature of a requirement for restriction, has been carefully reviewed. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Restriction has been required among what the Examiner considers to be patentably distinct species of the invention, as follows:

- A. Group I, drawn to a functionalized polymer, presently comprising claims 1 and 2;
- B. Group II, drawn to a method of making a polymer, presently comprising claims 3-5;